

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On pages 2-8 of the Office Action, claims 548-567, 569-571, 577, 578, 580-584, 586, 588, 590-611, 617, 618, 620-627, 629-649, 655, 656, 658-662, 664, 666-680, 683, 684, 686-695, 697-714, 719, 720, and 722-729 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,837,088 to Freedman (the “Freedman patent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,407,718 to Popat, et al. (the “Popat patent”).

On pages 9-10 of the Office Action, claims 572, 573, 612, 613, 650, 651, 681, 682, 715, and 716 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Freedman patent in view of the Popat patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,704,317 to Hickenbotham, et al. (the “Hickenbotham patent”).

On pages 10-11 of the Office Action, claims 574-576, 614-616, 652-654, 717, and 718 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Freedman patent in view of the Popat patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,198,275 to Klein (the “Klein patent”).

On pages 11-12 of the Office Action, claims 579, 619, 657, 685, and 721 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Freedman patent in view of the Popat patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,842,722 to Carlson (the “Carlson patent”).

The Invention

Before addressing the specific claim limitations, it will be helpful first to briefly summarize the invention of the pending claims.

The present invention resides in a printable business card sheet including a laminate sheet construction and a continuous sheet. The laminate sheet construction includes a facestock sheet construction and an internally positioned film layer. The facestock sheet construction includes a facestock sheet that is a cardstock sheet. The film

layer is adhered to the facestock sheet with an adhesive layer. The continuous sheet is attached to the back side of the facestock sheet construction, and is directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer. The film layer and the adhesive layer are adapted such that when a peeling force is applied to the printable business card sheet, the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and whereby the laminate sheet construction is a dry laminate sheet construction. The printable business card sheet also includes facestock continuous through-cut lines through the facestock sheet construction, but not through-cut through the continuous sheet. The through-cut lines define, at least in part, perimeter edges of printable business cards and a matrix waste portion around the printable business cards. The entire front faces of all the printable business cards are blank. The laminate sheet construction is sized, constructed, and capable of being sheet-fed through a printer or copier for a sheet-fed printing operation on the printable business cards. Areas of the continuous sheet are positioned over back sides of all of the through-cut lines, thereby the continuous sheet is structurally capable of holding the printable business cards and matrix waste portion together during the printing operation. The top surface of the facestock sheet construction is constructed and adapted to receive indicia printed on the top surface during the printing operation. The continuous sheet and the through-cut lines are constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky. The printable business cards are arranged in a grid, and the grid includes a column of printable business cards. Adjacent ones of the printable business cards in the column directly abut one another and share a common edge.

The present invention also resides in a printable business card sheet that includes a laminate sheet construction. The laminate sheet construction includes a facestock sheet construction, a continuous sheet attached to the back side of the facestock sheet construction, and an internally positioned film layer. The laminate sheet construction is free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet. The facestock sheet construction includes a facestock sheet, and the facestock sheet is a cardstock sheet. The

printable business card sheet also includes facestock continuous through-cut lines through the facestock sheet construction but not through-cut through the continuous sheet. The through-cut lines define, at least in part, perimeter edges of printable business cards and a matrix waste portion around the printable business cards. The laminate sheet construction is sized, constructed, and capable of being sheet-fed through a printer or copier for a sheet-fed printing operation on the printable business cards. Areas of the continuous sheet are positioned over back sides of all of the through-cut lines and thereby the continuous sheet is structurally capable of holding the printable business cards and the matrix waste portion together during the printing operation. The top surface of the facestock sheet construction is constructed and adapted to receive indicia printed on the top surface during the printing operation. The continuous sheet and the through-cut lines are constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky. The printable business cards are arranged in a grid and the grid includes a column of printable business cards. Adjacent ones of the printable business cards in the column directly abut one another and share a common edge.

The present invention also resides in a printable business card sheet that includes a dry laminate sheet construction and a continuous sheet. The dry laminate sheet construction includes a facestock sheet construction and an internally positioned film layer. The film layer is directly adjacent to the continuous sheet. The film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards. The facestock sheet construction includes a facestock sheet, and the facestock sheet is a cardstock sheet. The continuous sheet is attached to the back side of the facestock sheet construction. The printable business card sheet also includes facestock continuous through-cut lines through the facestock sheet construction to the back side but not through-cut through the continuous sheet. The through-cut lines define, at least in part, perimeter edges of printable business cards and a matrix waste portion around the printable business cards. The dry laminate sheet construction is sized, constructed, and capable of being sheet-fed through a printer or copier for a sheet-fed printing operation

on the printable business cards. Areas of the continuous sheet are positioned over back sides of all of the through-cut lines and thereby the continuous sheet is structurally capable of holding the printable business cards and the matrix waste portion together during the printing operation. The top surface of the facestock sheet construction is constructed and adapted to receive indicia printed on the top surface during the printing operation. The continuous sheet and the through-cut lines are constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky. The printable business cards are arranged in a grid on the facestock sheet construction. The grid includes a column of printable business cards, and adjacent ones of the printable business cards in the column abut one another and share a common edge.

The present invention also resides in a printable business card sheet that includes a laminate sheet construction. The laminate sheet construction includes a facestock sheet construction, a continuous sheet, and an internally positioned film layer. The laminate sheet construction is rectangular with opposing side edges and opposing end edges. The facestock sheet construction includes a facestock sheet, and the facestock sheet is a cardstock sheet. The continuous sheet is attached to the back side of the facestock sheet construction, and is bonded to the film layer without adhesive. The printable business card sheet also includes facestock continuous through-cut lines through the facestock sheet construction but not through-cut through the continuous sheet. The through-cut lines define, at least in part, perimeter edges of printable business cards and a matrix waste portion around the printable business cards. The laminate sheet construction is sized, constructed, and capable of being sheet-fed through a printer or copier for a sheet-fed printing operation on the printable business cards. Areas of the continuous sheet are positioned over back sides of all of the through-cut lines and thereby the continuous sheet is structurally capable of holding the printable business cards and the matrix waste portion together during the printing operation. The top surface of the facestock sheet construction is constructed and adapted to receive indicia printed on the top surface during the printing operation. The continuous sheet and the through-cut lines are

constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky. The business cards are in a central area block of the facestock sheet and are arranged in a grid. The grid includes a column of printable business cards, and adjacent ones of the printable business cards in the column directly abut one another and share a common edge. A border portion of the laminate sheet construction surrounds the block and extends from ends of the through-cut lines to both of the side edges and to both of the end edges.

The present invention also resides in a printable business cards sheet that includes a laminate sheet construction. The laminate sheet construction includes a facestock sheet construction, a continuous sheet, and an internally positioned film layer. The facestock sheet construction includes a facestock sheet, and the facestock sheet is a cardstock sheet. The continuous sheet is attached to the back side of the facestock sheet construction. The printable business card sheet also includes facestock continuous through-cut lines through the facestock sheet construction but not through-cut the continuous sheet. The through-cut lines define, at least in part, perimeter edges of printable business cards and a matrix waste portion around the printable business cards. The laminate sheet construction is sized, constructed, and capable of being sheet-fed through a printer or copier for a sheet-fed printing operation on the printable business cards. Areas of the continuous sheet are positioned over back sides of all of the through-cut lines and thereby the continuous sheet is structurally capable of holding the printable business cards and the matrix waste portion together during the printing operation. The top surface of the facestock sheet construction is constructed and adapted to receive indicia printed on the top surface during the printing operation. The continuous sheet and the through-cut lines are constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky. The printable cards are arranged in a grid, and the grid includes a first column of the printable business cards and a second column of the printable business cards. The first and second columns directly side-by-side abut one another. Adjacent ones of the printable business cards in

the first column directly abut one another and share a common edge. Adjacent ones of the printable business cards in the second column directly abut one another and share a common edge. The laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards.

Rejection of Claims 548-567, 569-571, 577, 578, 580-584, 586, 588, 590-611, 617, 618, 620-627, 629-649, 655, 656, 658-662, 664, 666-680, 683, 684, 686-695, 697-714, 719, 720, and 722-729 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based on the Freedman Patent and the Popat Patent

On pages 2-8 of the Office Action, claims 548-567, 569-571, 577, 578, 580-584, 586, 588, 590-611, 617, 618, 620-627, 629-649, 655, 656, 658-662, 664, 666-680, 683, 684, 686-695, 697-714, 719, 720, and 722-729 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Freedman patent in view of the Popat patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of claims 548-567, 569-571, 577, 578, 580-584, 586, 588, 590-611, 617, 618, 620-627, 629-649, 655, 656, 658-662, 664, 666-680, 683, 684, 686-695, 697-714, 719, 720, and 722-729.

Applicants note that the Examiner, in addition to rejecting the above noted claims, has provided arguments for the rejection of claims 479-482, 486-489, 491-514, 524-529, and 531-537 on pages 2-8 of the Office Action, however, all of these claims had been canceled previously in the Amendment filed July 11, 2007. None of the rejected claims depend from these canceled claims, either directly or indirectly. It is unclear why the Examiner has chosen to supply arguments directed to previously canceled claims. Applicants further note that the Examiner has provided *no* support for the rejection of currently pending claims 548-567, 569-571, 577, 578, 580-584, 586, 588, 590-611, 617, 618, 620-627, 629-649, 655, 656, 658-662, 664, 666-680, 683, 684, 686-695, 697-714, 719, 720, and 722-729 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants assume that the Examiner made multiple typographical errors, or may have meant to allow the pending claims, since the rejections are unsupported.

Applicants, however, will respond to the arguments that the Examiner has provided, even though the arguments are not directed toward any pending claims.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner states “[t]hat some of the grid lines extend aFreedman [sic] and outwardly of the first and second side cut lines.” The meaning of this sentence is unclear. Applicants notes that the sentence “[t]hat some of the grid lines extend *across* and outwardly of the first and second side cut lines,” can be found on page 12 of the Office Action dated April 18, 2005; on page 7 of the Office Action dated January 12, 2006; and on page 6 of the Office Action dated August 23, 2006 (emphasis added). Additionally, the sentence “[t]hat some of the grid lines extend aMcKillip [sic] and outwardly of the first and second side cut lines,” can be found on page 6 of the Office Action dated April 5, 2007. Applicants assume the sentence should read as in the Office Actions of April 18, 2005, January 12, 2006, and August 23, 2006, and that the Examiner erred when replacing “Cross” with “McKillip” in the April 5, 2007 Office Action, and when replacing “Cross” with “Freedman” in the current Office Action.

Also on page 6 of the Office Action, with reference to claims 488, 495-497 and 504, the Examiner states:

Freedman discloses that the carrier sheet comprises includes [sic] a base paper sheet of densified bleached kraft sheet, since the reference discloses the liner proper is a base paper sheet such as densified bleached kraft sheet (col. 5, lines 32-34).

However, it appears the Examiner has misquoted the Freedman patent. In col. 5, lines 32-34, the Freedman patent actually states “without leaving behind any residue and without requiring special coatings or coating steps. It is this core which provides peel strengths which are sufficiently. . .” Respectfully, the Freedman patent *fails* to teach “densified bleached kraft sheet.” Additionally, in the Office Action dated April 5, 2007, on page 7, the Examiner stated:

McKillip discloses that the carrier sheet comprises includes [sic] a base paper sheet of densified bleached kraft sheet, since the reference discloses

the liner proper is a base paper sheet such as densified bleached kraft sheet (col. 5, lines 32-34).

However, it appears that the Examiner also had misquoted the McKillip patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,462,488). In col. 5, lines 32-34, the McKillip patent actually states “member and, in turn, away from the first layer of material; and g) simultaneously depressing the at least one card member and adjacently positioned portions of the first layer . . .” Respectfully, the McKillip patent also *fails* to teach “densified bleached kraft sheet.” Applicants believe the Examiner was actually referencing U.S. Patent 4,863,772 to Cross (the “Cross patent”) and erroneously substituted “McKillip” in place of “Cross” in the April 5, 2007 Office Action, and “Freedman” in place of “Cross” in the current Office Action. However, Applicants successfully overcame the Cross patent in an Amendment filed October 23, 2006 and so the relevance of a quotation from the Cross patent is unclear in the current Office Action.

On page 3 of the Office Action, with regard to the Freedman patent, the Examiner states:

The carrier sheet and the through-cut lines are deemed to be constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the carrier sheet after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky, since the reference discloses that the labels will be picked-off individually by the user and that the dry labels of the invention have no tack when individually handled (figure 2).

The statement by the Examiner is erroneous and unclear. It is unclear how the Examiner determines that “labels . . . picked-off individually by the user . . .,” teaches or suggests “dry labels of the invention have no tack when individually handled . . .” Furthermore, it is unclear which “figure 2” the Examiner is referring to. FIG. 2 of the present application is clearly labeled “PRIOR ART” and therefore *does not* depict “dry labels of the invention . . .” FIG. 2 of the Freedman patent is broken into four figures, none of which portray “labels . . . picked-off individually by the user . . .” If the Examiner is referring to FIG. 2 of the Freedman patent, then the Examiner appears to be

misinterpreting the teaching of the Freedman patent. In col. 1, lines 6-14, the Freedman patent teaches:

a method and means for using pressure sensitive adhesive label technology to adhesively mount coupons . . . on containers . . . for pick-off by the consumer or end user, but in such a way that the face piece comes off the substrate 'dry', leaving no sticky area either on the bottom of the face piece . . .

Thus, the Freedman patent teaches mounted *coupons* for pick-off by a consumer or end user, not *labels* for pick-off by the user, as the Examiner contends. In fact, the Freedman patent teaches "the labelling equipment used by the labeller may pull the liner 24 back around the peelback edge to advance each individual label . . . into progressive adhesive contact with a passing substrate . . .," in col. 4, lines 27-32. Thus the *label* as taught in the Freedman patent is certainly tacky, since the Freedman patent clearly states the label is in adhesive contact with the substrate. Furthermore, the label of the Freedman patent is not picked-off individually by the user, as the Examiner states. The Freedman patent teaches "[t]he end user can then remove the outer part 52 of the label . . . leaving the lower part 54 permanently mounted on the substrate 50," in col. 4, lines 44-47, and as shown in FIGS. 1D and 2D. Thus, the Freedman patent teaches only that the outer part of the label is removable from a substrate. Accordingly, the Freedman patent *fails* to teach or suggest "the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . .," as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695.

In addition, the Examiner has *not* indicated that the Freedman patent teaches "the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . .," as required by independent claim 548; "the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet," as required by independent claim 590; "the film layer being directly adjacent to the

continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695. Indeed, the Freedman patent *fails* to teach or suggest any of these requirements of independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, or 695.

With regard to the Popat patent, in col. 2, line 67, to col. 3, line 1, the Popat patent teaches “[e]ach label is provided with an adhesive layer 30 which permits the user to apply the label to another surface.” In col. 3, lines 6-11, the Popat patent teaches “label assembly 20 includes a label layer 40 having a pressure sensitive adhesive coating . . . mounted onto backing layer 28 . . . [t]his backing layer has a silicone release coating to permit easy removal of the mounted labels . . .” Thus, the Popat patent teaches *only* pressure sensitive adhesive labels with back side surfaces that are tacky. Accordingly, the Popat patent *fails* to teach or suggest “the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . . ,” as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695.

Furthermore, the Popat patent teaches “[t]he present invention relates generally to substantially transparent *paper* labels . . . ,” in col. 1, lines 6-7 (emphasis added). Indeed, the Popat patent discusses only transparent paper labels and nowhere describes labels including a film layer. In addition, the Examiner has *not* indicated that the Popat patent teaches “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as

required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695. The Popat patent *fails* to teach or suggest any of these requirements of independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, or 695.

Accordingly, *neither* the Freedman patent, *nor* the Popat patent, *nor* the combination of the Freedman patent and Popat patent teach or suggest “the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . . ,” as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695. Additionally, *neither* the Freedman patent, *nor* the Popat patent, *nor* the combination of the Freedman patent and Popat patent teach or suggest “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695. Therefore, Applicants submit that the § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 479, and dependent claims 480-482, 486-489, 491-497, 499-514, 524-529, and 531-537 all of

which depend from independent claim 479, is improper and should be withdrawn. Additionally, although *no* support for the rejection of pending claims 548-567, 569-571, 577, 578, 580-584, 586, 588, 590-611, 617, 618, 620-627, 629-649, 655, 656, 658-662, 664, 666-680, 683, 684, 686-695, 697-714, 719, 720, and 722-729 has been provided, the rejection of independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695 based on the Freedman patent, the Popat patent, or the combination of the Freedman patent and Popat patent, and the rejection of dependent claims 549-567, 569-571, 577, 578, 580-584, 586, 588, 591-611, 617, 618, 620-627, 630-649, 655, 656, 658-662, 666-680, 683, 684, 686-694, 697-714, 719, 720, and 722-729, which depend from independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 572, 573, 612, 613, 650, 651, 681, 682, 715, and 716 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based on the Freedman Patent, the Popat Patent, and the Hickenbotham Patent

On pages 9-10 of the Office Action, claims 572, 573, 612, 613, 650, 651, 681, 682, 715, and 716 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Freedman patent in view of the Popat patent, and further in view of the Hickenbotham patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of claims 572, 573, 612, 613, 650, 651, 681, 682, 715, and 716.

In rejecting claims 572, 573, 612, 613, 650, 651, 681, 682, 715, and 716, the Examiner states “Freedman and Popat are relied upon as described above.” Applicants has already noted that the Examiner has *failed* to support *any* rejection of pending independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695, from which claims 572, 573, 612, 613, 650, 651, 681, 682, 715, and 716 depend, based on the combination of the Freedman patent and the Popat patent.

Applicants, however, will respond to the arguments that the Examiner has provided, even though the rejections of independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695, from which claims 572, 573, 612, 613, 650, 651, 681, 682, 715, and 716 depend, are unsupported.

As described above, the Freedman patent, the Popat patent, and the combination of the Freedman patent and the Popat patent *fail* to disclose, teach, or suggest “the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . . ,” as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695; “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695.

In col. 6, lines 9-12, the Hickenbotham patent describes FIG. 10 as showing “a labelstock 100 comprising a carrier web 101 to which is releasably adhered facestock 102 including an underlying pressure-sensitive adhesive layer 103.” The Hickenbotham patent describes labels cut into the labelstock in Example 2 (see col. 6, lines 40-44). However, one skilled in the art would understand that labels resulting from the Hickenbotham patent’s labelstock would have an exposed pressure-sensitive adhesive surface after they are removed from the carrier web, and thus would have a back side surface that is tacky. The Hickenbotham patent teaches *only* pressure-sensitive adhesive labels. Additionally, the Hickenbotham patent is silent with respect to the inclusion of a film layer in the invention. Accordingly, the Hickenbotham patent *fails* to teach or suggest “the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the

matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . . ,” as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695; “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695.

Accordingly, *neither* the Freedman patent *nor* the Popat patent (as previously discussed), *nor* the Hickenbotham patent, *nor* the combination of the Freedman patent, Popat patent and the Hickenbotham patent teaches or suggests “the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . . ,” as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695; “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to

delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695. Applicants submit that the U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 572, 573, 612, 613, 650, 651, 681, 682, 715, and 716, all of which depend from independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 574-576, 614-616, 652-654, 717, and 718 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based on the Freedman Patent, the Popat Patent, and the Klein Patent

On pages 10-11 of the Office Action, claims 574-576, 614-616, 652-654, 717, and 718 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Freedman patent in view of the Popat patent, and further in view of the Klein patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of claims 574-576, 614-616, 652-654, 717, and 718.

In rejecting claims 574-576, 614-616, 652-654, 717, and 718, the Examiner states “Freedman and Popat are relied upon as described above.” Applicants have already noted that the Examiner has *failed* to support *any* rejection of pending independent claims 548, 590, 629, and 695, from which claims 574-576, 614-616, 652-654, 717, and 718 depend, based on the combination of the Freedman patent and the Popat patent.

Applicants, however, will respond to the arguments that the Examiner has provided, even though the rejections of independent claims 548, 590, 629, and 695, from which claims 574-576, 614-616, 652-654, 717, and 718 depend, are unsupported.

As described above, the Freedman patent, the Popat patent, and the combination of the Freedman patent and the Popat patent *fail* to disclose, teach, or suggest “the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . . ,” as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, and 695;

“the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695.

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “[t]he backing sheet with perforations [of the Klein patent] corresponds to Applicant’s carrier sheet with flexibility/cut lines.” Accordingly, based upon FIG. 6 of the Klein patent, the Examiner appears to be considering undefined layer 130 as the backing sheet with perforations, since the only perforations are the micro-perforations 300 shown in layer 130. Lines 100 and 200 are both score lines (see col. 3, line 24 and the paragraph beginning in col. 3, line 44). In col. 3, lines 29-32, the Klein patent teaches “the lift out panel 105 may be removed from the card 85 after printing with the contact adhesive 95 being intact . . . and thereafter affixed to any other surface as desired.” Thus, the Klein patent teaches a contact adhesive backed lift out panel. The Klein patent is silent with respect to films. Accordingly, the Klein patent *fails* to teach or suggest “the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . . ,” as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, and 695; “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by

independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695.

Accordingly, *neither* the Freedman patent *nor* the Popat patent (as previously discussed), *nor* the Klein patent, *nor* the combination of the Freedman patent, Popat patent and the Klein patent teaches or suggests “the continuous sheet and the through-cut lines being constructed and adapted to allow the business cards to be removed and separated from the continuous sheet and from the matrix waste portion after the printing operation into individual printed business cards whose back side surfaces are non-tacky . . . ,” as required by independent claims 548, 590, 629, and 695; “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695. Applicants submit that the U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 574-576, 614-616, 652-654, 717, and 718, all of which depend from independent claims 548, 590, 629, and 695, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 579, 619, 657, 685, and 721 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based on the Freedman Patent, the Popat Patent, and the Carlson Patent

On pages 11-12 of the Office Action, claims 579, 619, 657, 685, and 721 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Freedman patent in view of the Popat patent, and further in view of the Carlson patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of claims 579, 619, 657, 685, and 721.

In rejecting claims 579, 619, 657, 685, and 721, the Examiner states “Freedman and Popat are relied upon as described above.” Applicants has already noted that the Examiner has *failed* to support *any* rejection of pending claims in this application based on the combination of the Freedman patent and the Popat patent, much less independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695 from which claims 579, 619, 657, 685, and 721 depend.

Applicants, however, will respond to the arguments that the Examiner has provided, even though the rejections of independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695, from which claims 579, 619, 657, 685, and 721 depend, are unsupported.

As described above, the Freedman patent, the Popat patent, and the combination of the Freedman patent and the Popat patent *fail* to teach or suggest “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . . ,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a

delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695.

The Carlson patent identifies cards 20 in FIGS. 1, 3-5, 7 and 9; cards 54 in FIGS. 11-12; and cards 70 in FIG. 13. In FIGS. 2 and 10, adhesive 18 adheres the front layer 16 to the sheetstock 12, in which card 20 is formed. In FIGS. 5-8, no continuous sheet is present. In FIG. 12, card 54 is adhered to sheetstock 12 with adhesive 14. In FIGS. 14 and 15, card 70 is adhered to single sheet 58 by adhesive 64. Thus, in FIGS. 2, 10, 12, 14 and 15, an adhesive adheres the card to the continuous sheet. Accordingly, the Carlson patent *fails* to teach or suggest “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . .,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695.

Accordingly, *neither* the Freedman patent *nor* the Popat patent (as previously discussed), *nor* the Carlson patent, *nor* the combination of the Freedman patent, the Popat patent, and the Carlson patent teaches or suggests “the continuous sheet being directly adjacent to the back side of the film layer . . . and . . . the printable business card sheet delaminates at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet . . .,” as required by independent claim 548; “the laminate sheet construction being free of adhesive between the film layer and the continuous sheet,” as required by independent claim 590; “the film layer being directly adjacent to the continuous sheet; and the film layer and the continuous sheet forming a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as

Appl. No. 09/158,728
Response dated October 11, 2010
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2010

required by independent claim 629; “the continuous sheet being bonded to the film layer without adhesive,” as required by independent claim 664; or “wherein the laminate sheet construction is adapted to delaminate at an interface of the film layer and the continuous sheet and/or wherein the film layer and the continuous sheet form a delamination interface for the printable business cards,” as required by independent claim 695.

Applicants submit that the U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 579, 619, 657, 685, and 721, which depend from independent claims 548, 590, 629, 664, and 695, respectively, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants believe the arguments set forth herein place this application in condition for allowance. An early notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application not in condition for a notice of allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned practitioner at the telephone number listed below to discuss steps to place the application into condition for allowance. Payment for fees due in connection with the filing of this Amendment is made via credit card. In the event of a payment deficiency, or if additional fees are due, please charge the fees to Avery Dennison’s Deposit Account No. 013025.

Respectfully submitted,
AVERY DENNISON CORPORATION

Dated: October 11, 2010 By: /Ronald Ugolick - Reg. No. 57,080/
Ronald Ugolick - Reg. No. 57,080

Customer No. 63543
Avery Dennison Corporation
Law Department
150 North Orange Grove Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91103
Phone (714) 674-8128; Fax (626) 304-2251

Appl. No. 09/158,728
Response dated October 11, 2010
Reply to Office Action of April 15, 2010